



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/302,552      | 04/30/1999  | STEPHEN SAVITZKY     | 15358-46            | 7040             |

20350 7590 06/16/2004

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP  
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER  
EIGHTH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2176

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2004

16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

OK

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/302,552

Applicant(s)

SAVITZKY ET AL.

Examiner

Maikhanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1- 13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1- 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 15.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***DETAILED ACTION***

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed 04/08/2004 to the original application filed 04/30/1999; IDS filed 04/08/2004.
2. Claims 1-13 are currently pending in this application. Claim 13 has been added. Claim 1 and 9 have been amended. Claims 1 and 9 are independent claims.

***Request Continuation for Examination***

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/08/2004 has been entered.

***Specification***

4. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds the limit of 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).
5. The disclosure is further objected to because information regarding related applications cited in page 3 has not been updated.

**Information Disclosure Statement**

6. The information disclosure statement filed 04/08/2004 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed (e.g., a copy of the reference AE needs to be submitted). It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 and 6-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **MacPhail** (U.S. 5,179,718 – issued 01/1993, as cited by Applicant in the IDS – paper # 15).

**As to independent claim 1**, McPhail teaches in an electronic document handling system, a method of manipulating documents (*Abstract*) comprising the steps of:

- generating a staple data object, for representing an association of selected pages and selected documents (*establishing a staple relationship between two documents;; Abstract/ combining documents together in a staple relationship within a context of a folder; col.2, lines 58-60/ col.3, lines 45-53 and col.8, lines 7-10*);

- generating an electronic cover sheet for the staple data object (*The system then maintains the staple relationship between the identified documents within the context of the specified folder document; Abstract*);

- accepting from a user a list of at least one page of at least one electronic document (*An end user indicates to the system that a staple relationship is to be created between at least two identified documents stored therein; col.2, lines 61-63/ col.3, lines 1-10 and col.4, lines 50-55*);

- referencing each page or each electronic document in the list as an item of the staple data object (*The staple relationship is then defined by entering an indication that the staple relationship is restricted to the context of the folder document ...pointers to the physical locations of the at least two documents in the system; col.2, lines 63- col3, line 2*);

- accepting a staple instruction from a user (*the server files the identified documents into the library as specified by the staple relationship defined by the end user; col.3, lines 8-10 and lines 45-59*); and

- indicating the existence of the association of selected pages and selected documents together at one time (*e.g., a determination is made whether the staple relationship is to exist within the context of a folder; col.9, lines 5-27*).

McPhail does not explicitly specifically teach “cryptographically securing the data object in response to receipt of the staple instruction”. However, McPhail discloses “specify a security level to associate within the document that is being filed” (col.4, lines 56-64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the teaching of McPhail for cryptographically securing the data object in

response to receipt of the staple instruction in order to provide means for controlling the access to the document during its life in the library.

**As to dependent claim 2**, MacPhail teaches accepting a manually input list (*col.4, lines 39-55*).

**As to dependent claim 3**, McPhail teaches accepting a computer-generated list (*col.4, lines 39-55*)

**As to dependent claim 6**, McPhail teaches copying the selected pages and selected documents in a stack to static storage (*col.3, lines 60-67*).

**As to dependent claim 7**, MacPhail teaches copying the selected pages and selected documents in a stack to a local storage device local to the electronic document handling system (*col.3, line 60-col.4, line 12*).

**As to dependent claim 8**, MacPhail teaches displaying a first list of documents, wherein the first list of documents lists the documents that are selected for inclusion in an open stack; displaying a second list of document, wherein the second list of documents list documents that have not been selected for inclusion in an open stack; and displaying a user interface control operative to obtain selections from a user of documents from the second list for inclusion in an open stack (*col.4, lines 13-38* ).

**As to independent claim 9**, the rejection of independent claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full. However, claim 9 further recites:

- opening a secured stack upon receipt of a stack open instruction;
- presenting the contents of the secured stack for perusal by the user;
- accepting additions and deletions of items on the secured stack; and

- securing the secure stack upon receipt of a stack restaple operation.

McPhail teaches:

- opening a secured stack upon receipt of a stack open instruction (*a EU can ask the system 10 to search for all documents regarding a particular subject and by a certain author which was filed in the library; col.4, lines 46-59*);
- presenting the contents of the secured stack for perusal by the user (*the system presents the EU with a list of the documents which meet the search criteria; col.4, lines 50-52*);
- accepting additions and deletions of items on the secured stack (*delete documents from the library; col.4, lines 57-58 and col.6, lines 15-19*); and
- securing the secure stack upon receipt of a stack restaple operation (*allow authorized end users other than the EU who filed the document to retrieve the document from the library and perform searches for and retrieve documents in the library for other end user; col.4, lines 60-67*).

**As to dependent claim 10**, MacPhail teaches using a stack signature to secure the stack object, wherein the stack signature is a checksum of the contents of all the selected pages and selected documents in the stack, signed by the digital signature of a user or the digital signature or private key of a system (*col.4, lines 59-64*).

**As to dependent claim 11**, MacPhail teaches storing the electronic cover sheet in a stack database, where it can be referenced (*col.8, lines 32-37*).

**As to dependent claim 12**, MacPhail teaches generating controls for adding and deleting selected pages and selected documents from the stack (*An access control model object; col.5, lines 23-25 and Fig.2*).

**As to dependent claim 13**, MacPhail teaches the electronic cover sheet includes a visual indication that the existence of the association of selected pages and selected documents together at one time (*relationship is to be created between at least two identified documents; col.2, lines 1-67/ establish the staple relationship between a pair documents; col.3, lines 45-54*). Note the discussion of claim 1 above for rejection of “cryptographically securing.”

8. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **MacPhail** in view of **IBM** “Technical Disclosure Bulletin” (issued 07/1992).

**As to dependent claim 4**, MacPhail does not explicitly teach “presenting a user with an online form as an aid to selecting pages or documents for association as a stack.”

IBM teaches presenting a user with an online form as an aid to selecting pages or documents for association as a stack (*on-line documents ... the need for an on-line stapler; page 1*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from IBM in the system of MacPhail because IBM’s teaching would have provided the capability for quickly and easily associating on-line, soft copy documents to another.

**As to dependent claim 5**, MacPhail does not explicitly teach “prompting for the staple instruction by presenting the user with a stapler icon which, when selected, represents the staple instruction.”



IBM teaches prompting for the staple instruction by presenting the user with a stapler icon which, when selected, represents the staple instruction (*a small stapler icon ... The user selects the stapler icons; page 1*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from IBM in the system of MacPhail because IBM's teaching would have provided the capability for quickly and easily associating on-line, soft copy documents to another.

### ***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments filed 04/08/2003 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-0092. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Maikhanh Nguyen  
June 4, 2004

  
JOSEPH FEILD  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER